

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended, and claims 4-20 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the foregoing amendments and new claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

RECEIPT OF FOREIGN PRIORITY PAPERS:

On page 1, box 12, the Examiner indicates that none of the foreign priority documents have been received for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §119. As indicated in the Continuing Utility Patent Application Transmittal, the foreign priority documents were filed in the parent application, United States Patent Application No. 10/256,244. As such, the foreign priority documents do not need to be again submitted in the instant application. MPEP 201.14(b)(II). Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner acknowledge prior receipt of the foreign priority documents received in the parent application, such as by checking the appropriate box in a subsequent action.

PROVISIONAL OBVIOUSNESS TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION:

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner provisionally rejects claims 1-3 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/806,107. Since U.S. Patent Application No. 10/806,107 has not yet been issued as a patent, and since claims 1-3 of the instant application have not yet been indicated as allowable, it is believed that any submission of a Terminal Disclaimer or arguments as to the non-obvious nature of the claims would be premature. MPEP 804(I)(B). As such, it is respectfully requested that the applicant be allowed to address any obviousness-type double patenting issues remaining once the rejection of the claims are resolved and that the rejection be reconsidered in light of the claims presented above.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action at pages 3-4, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Ichihara (U.S. Patent No. 6,396,792). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

By way of review, Ichihara discloses a waveform of recording pulses having erasure pulses Pc1 and Pc2 used as erasure signals. As shown in FIGs. 1A and 1B, the first erase

pulse is set to the Pc1 level and the last erase pulse is set to the lower Pc2 level in order to create a space. (Col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 15). However, there is no suggestion that the space is created with the first pulse being Pc2 or the last pulse being Pc1.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, among other features, that "the erase pattern comprises a multi-pulse having with a power level of a leading pulse of the erase pattern set at a low level of the multi-pulse and a power level of a trailing pulse of the erase pulse set at a high level of the multi-pulse." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Ichihara does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2 and 3 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from claim 1.

PATENTABILITY OF NEW CLAIMS:

Claim 4 is deemed patentable due at least to Ichihara not disclosing that the erasure pulses Pc1 and Pc2 affect one or more of the recording pulses, whereas claim 4 recites, among other features, "a first one of the first pulses of the recording pattern being adjusted according to a property of the last one of the second pulses of the erase pattern."

Claims 5-18 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from corresponding claims 1 and 4.

Claims 19 and 20 are deemed patentable due at least to reasons similar to how claim 1 is deemed patentable.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

SERIAL NO. 10/806,215

DOCKET NO. 1293.1278C6

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI LLP

By: 

James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983

1400 Eye Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510

Date: Nov. 10, 2005